

The Bucks County Gazette.

VOL. XXI.

BRISTOL, BUCKS COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1894

NO. 23.

Upper Delaware River Transportation Company.

WINTER SCHEDULE:
To take effect on Monday, November 20, 1893.
The Steamer

COLUMBIA
Leaves Bristol City (Sunday except) for Philadelphia at 7:15 A. M.
Returning, leaves Philadelphia for Bristol at 2:15 P. M.
Fare, 50 cents.

Pennsylvania Railroad.

In effect November 19th, 1893.

Leave Bristol for Philadelphia (Broad St.)
*2:46, 5:35, 6:30, 6:51, 7:19, *8:12, 8:23, *9:14, 9:23, 9:52, A. M. 12:05, 12:55, 1:17, *3:03, 4:02, *4:58, 5:43, 6:25, *7:06, 8:30, 9:27, 10:33 P. M.
Sunday trains, *2:46, 7:00, *8:11, 9:00, *9:23, *10:26 A. M. *12:04, 12:25, 5:05, 5:13, *7:21, 8:00, 8:50, 9:28, 10:00 P. M.

Leave Philadelphia (Broad St.) for Bristol.

12:01, 3:20, 6:07, *6:50, 7:34, 8:30, 9:55, *11:14 (Saturday only) A. M.
12:01, 1:10, 1:50, 2:43, 3:32, *4:14, 4:20, *5:00, 5:25, *6:00, 6:05, 6:21, 7:27, 9:17, *10:00, 11:15 P. M.
Sunday trains, 12:01, 7:40, *8:30, 9:05, 11:45, A. M. 2:00, *5:20, 5:53, 7:27, *8:12, 10:25 P. M.

Express trains.

(*) Express trains.

BRISTOL POST OFFICE.

ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 7:00, 10:40 A. M., 2:20, 6:30 P. M. Closes at 7:50, 10:40 A. M., 5:30, 7:00 P. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 7:00, 7:45, 10:40 A. M., 1:30, 3:30, 5:20 P. M. Closes at 7:45, 10:40 A. M., 1:30, 3:30, 5:20 P. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 8:00 A. M. and 10:40 A. M. Closes at 11:45 A. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 8:00 A. M. and 10:40 A. M. Closes at 11:45 A. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 11:00 A. M. and 1:30 P. M. Closes at 2:30 P. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 11:00 A. M. and 1:30 P. M. Closes at 2:30 P. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 1:30 P. M. and 4:00 P. M. Closes at 5:00 P. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 1:30 P. M. and 4:00 P. M. Closes at 5:00 P. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 4:00 P. M. and 6:30 P. M. Closes at 7:30 P. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 4:00 P. M. and 6:30 P. M. Closes at 7:30 P. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 6:30 P. M. and 9:00 P. M. Closes at 10:00 P. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 6:30 P. M. and 9:00 P. M. Closes at 10:00 P. M.
NEW YORK-ARRIVES AT 9:00 P. M. and 11:30 P. M. Closes at 12:30 A. M.
PHILADELPHIA-ARRIVES AT 9:00 P. M. and 11:30 P. M. Closes at 12:30 A. M.

LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

The trolley is coming to town.

A Devotional Meeting of the W. C. T. U. will be held next Wednesday, Jan. 17, to which every one is welcome.

The annual meeting of the Bristol Improvement Company will be held on next Tuesday afternoon, at the Bristol Library.

There were no marriages reported at the Board of Health office for the month of December. There were twelve births.

The Rev. Mr. Goodhue, former pastor of the Bristol Baptist Church is expected to occupy his old pulpit on next Sunday.

The Rev. Mr. Joyce, rector of Christ Church, New Brunswick, N. J., will exchange pulpits with Rev. W. Bruce Morrow, next Sunday.

The annual meeting of the Stockholders of the Farmers National Bank for the election of Directors was held last Tuesday. The same Board and officers were re-elected.

List of letters remaining in Bristol post-office, January 11th, 1894: Rev. W. C. Burlew, Wm. Gifford, Wm. Harcliff, Jake Krizer, Thomas Leathart, Joseph McCaughy, Martin Higgins, Mrs. Silas P. Wood.

A meeting, to which a number of the leading citizens of Bristol have been invited, will be held to-morrow afternoon, at the Council Chamber, for the purpose of forming a Society for the relief of the poor of the borough.

Frederick Lancaster, son of Frederick and Mary Bithell, of Trenton, N. J., was killed at Morrisville, Monday afternoon by the Colonial express on the Pennsylvania railroad while returning to his home with two companions with whom he had been skating. He was 18 years old and he was employed in the Glasgow pottery.

At St. Mary's, Burlington, they have had the church organ rebuilt and enlarged, the improvements being now about completed. Mr. Matthews, the English organist at St. Mary's, was over in Bristol the other day and secured from Miss Laura Wood her promise to give an evening's organ recital at St. Mary's, on the 5th of February.

On last Tuesday evening the Bristol Masque Social, No. 1, was organized and elected the following officers: President, J. Bromley; Vice President, H. G. Hillborn; Secretary, W. A. Mohr; Asst. Secretary, J. N. Ayres; Treasurer, F. A. Levis. The social is organized on a sound moral basis, which being strictly adhered to will make it a success. They meet for the present in the tower of No. 2 Hose House.

The annual meeting of the Fidelity Building Company was held on last Tuesday evening. The secretary presented his annual report which should that the association was in a flourishing condition. The rate of earning last year was over 81 per cent. The total assets are \$88,732.23. The association loaned last year \$23,300, and \$8.07 of stock was withdrawn; the cash on hand amounts to \$1,587.82. The total number of shareholders is 196, holding 940 shares in nine series of stock. The Directors and officers re-elected are the same as last year.

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS.

The Fight for the Trolley—The Trolley Committee Not Sustained—A New Committee Takes Charge.

Last Monday night the trolley fight was on, after a season of quiet for several months. During the last few days the members of Council have been specially favored with documents and arguments in favor of and against the proposition of eliminating the words binding the proposed companies to such future legislation as any Council in its wisdom or in its antagonism may direct. The representatives of the companies claimed that the future legislation clause, unrestricted, would be a bar to their entrance to the borough, and the advocates of that clause were emphatic in their avowal that to allow the companies to invade the borough with no restriction for future exigencies that might arise then is contained in the present ordinance would be most unwise.

Before the hour arrived for the opening of Council the lobby was crowded with interested spectators; outside the entrance door were many more unable to gain admission. Several times a policeman had to clear the way to enable a member to reach his seat. A few minutes after 8 o'clock the Burgess gavel called the Council to order. The Clerk called the roll. A suggestion that the reading of the minutes be dispensed with was not favored, and after that perfunctory work was done, the reports of the standing committees were made.

Several of the committees had no reports to offer. The Police Committee reported that 14 arrests had been made during the month; that 236 foot travelers had found lodgings at the station house; that 7 electric lights had failed to shed their rays for one night during the month; and that in the case of Kelly vs. the Borough the judge had granted a non-suit to the defendant.

The Health, Sanitation and Poor Committee reported the town in fair sanitary condition; that the general health was good; that there was considerable destitution and that relief had been given to the poor in a number of instances; and that a typhoid fever case on Bath street had been removed to the Alms House.

The Special Committee having in charge the amendment of the trolley ordinance, through its chairman, Mr. Joseph R. Grundy, made the following report:

Your Committee to whom was referred the ordinance amending the ordinance passed May 1, 1893, entitled "An Ordinance prescribing the terms and conditions upon which the Burgess and Council of the Borough of Bristol consent to the construction, maintenance and operation of Street Passenger Railways operated by electrical power upon certain streets in said borough, which said streets are by ordinance to be hereafter named, set forth and described, and imposing regulations, conditions and restrictions in respect to Street Passenger Railway Companies using electrical power in the operation and maintenance of their railways; in respect to the erection and maintenance of poles and the stringing of wires thereon by such companies, and imposing conditions, regulations and restrictions upon such Street Passenger Railway Companies in respect to the maintenance of their tracks and road-bed," fully appreciating the importance of the matter in hand, the value to our community that would accrue from the introduction of railways, connecting the borough with outlying districts, and joining most heartily and enthusiastically in the popular wish of our citizens, that the convenience, ease of communication with our neighboring boroughs and towns these roads would afford, might be theirs to enjoy and that the trade of our merchants with these people might in this way be increased, have carefully and thoroughly reviewed the entire subject.

Our first movement was to arrange a meeting with the representatives of the Electrical Railway Companies seeking entrance into our borough.

Our next to correspond with towns and cities in Eastern Pennsylvania respecting provisions in their ordinances relating to electrical railroads, and also to interview and correspond with officers of electrical railways operating and constructing their roads under sections of ordinances, the same as now in force in this borough, which the companies seeking admission to our town object to.

The meeting with the representatives of the companies was duly held on the evening of Friday, December 29th.

The outcome of this meeting was that the only provision of the ordinance passed by this body May 1, 1893, which could not be harmonized upon, was the provision in it which held the companies subject to future legislation on the part of the borough respecting the operation, management, maintenance and construction of street passenger railways, and the two-fold argument advanced to support their objection was:

1st, That the chance of profit at this time from their venture was too remote, owing to the size of our community to warrant them in accepting the grant of right of way, and be liable at the same time to such legis-

lation as the representatives of the people might deem for the best interests of our citizens; and

2d, They did not feel that the duty elected representatives of the people, who would be chosen to councils from time to time in the future could be trusted to deal justly and fairly with them, even when owning and operating, as they will, so important a part in the life, convenience and prosperity of our borough.

Filled with a desire to yield every possible point consistent with the obligations we owe to our constituents, and to those who will follow us in control of the borough government, and in our great desire to obtain the construction of the proposed roads, and to meet the objection raised by the companies, that the present size of our community would not warrant them at this time in accepting the provisions holding them subject to future legislation, it was suggested by your Committee that this clause be not made operative in the grants made for right of way to the companies for such reasonable term of years as could be mutually agreed upon; that is, that they erect and operate their roads under the provisions of the borough ordinance now in force, which provides for such reasonable regulations and restrictions as are deemed sufficient at this time. So that during the time agreed upon, before any further legislation concerning them could be enacted, our community would grow and develop with the general prosperity of the country. In this time it could be demonstrated if the provisions of our ordinance properly provide for conditions of our town as they would then exist, and the value of the franchise granted to the companies could be demonstrated, as well as the value of these roads to our town.

This suggested concession failed to meet the approval of the representatives of the companies applying for admission, and this failure left for your Committee but one proposition to consider, which was to grant the right to use any or all of our streets as the roads may select and councils approve, for all time to come, only under such conditions and restrictions as we could now see our way clear to provide for. Your Committee following the advice of the borough council and guided by the examples of communities from whose ordinances we will quote later, and influenced by correspondence from a gentleman high in the esteem of the citizens of this borough, as one always alive to the best interests of our people, who is himself president of an electrical railway company in a borough about the size of Bristol, which has imposed conditions regarding future legislation similar to our own, unanimously and emphatically concluded, that we could only report with an unfavorable recommendation the ordinance presented to amend the ordinance passed May 1, 1893.

Our conclusion, may we add, was largely influenced by the failure of the representatives of the companies to entertain the removal of the clause for a period of time longer than the average years yet to live of the members of this body, showing to your Committee that mingled with their alleged fear of unfavorable legislation at a time when our borough was small, was an eye to the ultimate value of the franchise they were asking the borough to grant them forever.

With the foregoing, may we present to councils of the reasons which influenced our minds in an unfavorable recommendation of the proposed ordinance? May we read first from ordinances in other communities in Eastern Pennsylvania touching the question of future control? First, from Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, Catsaugu, Allentown, Williamsport and Phoenixville, also letter from our late townsman and Burgess, Francis Penimore, Esq.; all of which impress your Committee with the belief that were they to advise councils to stand by the ordinance as passed May 1, 1893, without modification of the future legislation clause as above suggested, they would be advising them to act in a wise and conservative conception of their public duties and responsibilities.

Touching the question and value of the franchise involved in this problem, we would suggest that the corporate body know as the Burgess and Council of the Borough of Bristol, exists for the purpose of caring for and protecting the rights which the constitution of the Commonwealth vests in our municipality. Members of Council, for the time being, are trustees holding the property of the borough in trust for the people, and they are under obligations to administer the trust that their rights and control, especially of their highways, shall at all time be secure. In this connection, may we cite from a late opinion delivered by Judge Mitchell, of the Supreme Court, in which the question of the value of the franchise is spoken of; and as a further illustration of this point, we would call attention to that section of a pamphlet on Municipal Affairs, which illustrates what the city of Philadelphia has given away by being misrepresented in councils showing, etc.

Some will say that it is folly to compare our town and conditions with those existing in Philadelphia and Buffalo, and if taken from a dollars and cents standpoint, they are right; but none can deny that the underlying principle that aims to secure for Buffalo and should have secured for Philadelphia, some adequate return for the valuable franchises granted, applies in a proportionately smaller way to Bristol.

We cannot refrain from commenting on the suggestion made by representatives of the trolley roads, to the effect that were they always to be assured

that such firm-minded men as are now in the Borough Council were to remain in office, they might consider the acceptance of the future legislation clause of our ordinance. May we not in thanking them for their kindly reference to us, return the compliment by adding that if the borough could always feel assured that these franchises would vest in the hands of men who seem now so solicitous for the welfare of the town, our minds might be more influenced in their favor; but when we stop to analyze the incorporators of these trolley companies, and find that only two of their number are in any way identified with our borough, and knowing the uncertainty, not only of life, but of the material affairs of this world, is it not well to ask ourselves if it is not within the range of possibilities that these franchises in the near future, if granted on terms asked for by the companies, might fall into the hands of men in no way identified with the interest of this borough who would use them solely for their own gain, and in viewing the question purely from the standpoint of men sworn to protect and care for the rights and interests of this community, should we not lay aside any kindly feeling and confidence in the honesty of intention of the incorporators and ask the question, that if any one has to take a leap in the dark as to what the future may develop, had we not best let them do it and not us; believing firmly that if we do not protect and look after the interest of our own town when we are put office for that purpose, who can the people hope to do it for them? These gentlemen who have incorporated these companies are bright, shrewd, active men of affairs, and as such are in business to make money. It is but natural that they should endeavor by all honorable means in their power to drive as good a bargain with the borough for what it has to grant as they can. The knowledge of these facts should make us alive to the interests we represent, and members and citizens should not lose sight of the thought that electrical railroad construction is in its infancy, and should these companies not see fit to come in under the terms prescribed by the borough now, the franchise loses nothing of its value by waiting, but rather increases with the development of our community, so that those who apply for it later can afford to deal more liberally with the borough, and what member of us would advocate the giving away now of what, in other communities, has been demonstrated to be a wise and profitable control?

There is another phase of the subject your Committee wish to speak of, and that is the charge made by representatives of the companies that they cannot trust the duly elected representatives of the people in council to deal justly with them in the future. This charge, as American citizens, if for no other, we should resent most emphatically, for if it be true, that the people whom the citizens elect to office from time to time cannot be trusted, then the principle of popular government on which this nation is founded is a failure. In this connection, may we ask, can any one point to any corporation in this town that has ever been oppressed or hampered by the action of council?

In conclusion, Gentlemen of Council, we would add that if it is your judgment to endorse the findings of your Committee as contained in this report, we are confident you will do so; sharing with us the regret we feel that the companies seeking admission to our borough could not see their way clear to accept the suggested compromise as to the length of time before the objectionable clause would be operative, which length of time should be ten, fifteen or twenty years would have met the cordial and unanimous endorsement of your Committee.

JOSEPH R. GRUNDY,
JAMES WRIGHT,
J. H. KELLY,
JOHN C. MAULE,
SAMUEL SCOTT,
Committee.

Mr. Grundy, in the presentation of the report, also embodied in it sections of street railway ordinances of several cities and boroughs in the state regarding future legislation. The ordinance of the city of Allentown provides that the Lehigh Valley Traction Company "shall be subject to such regulations, conditions, and restrictions as City Councils may hereafter make and from time to time impose by ordinance."

The ordinances of the city of Wilkes-Barre provide that the companies "shall be at all times subject to the control of the City Council as to change in the location of electric wires, change in street grade, change in location of track when necessary, and such other matters as are properly the subject of municipal control."

The ordinance of the borough of Catsaugu requires the trolley companies to be subject to "such alterations and lawful conditions, regulations, and restrictions as the Borough Council may hereafter make and from time to time impose by ordinance."

The ordinance of the city of Scranton contains the following paragraph: "And shall further agree that the said company will at all times hereafter be bound to observe and be subject to all ordinances of said city, with reference to passenger railways now in force or hereafter to be passed, not inconsistent with its charter rights."

Section 21 of the ordinance of the borough of Phoenixville says: "This

company and all others of a similar character, shall be subject to all ordinances regulating passenger railways that the Town Council of the borough of Phoenixville may hereafter enact."

Mr. Grundy also read a letter from ex-Burgess Francis Penimore in reply to a query as to whether since he had ceased to be a maker of borough laws and had become interested in obtaining grants from municipalities if there had been any change in his mind respecting the importance of the clause which held companies asking for rights of way subject to future legislation respecting the operation, maintenance, and construction of street passenger railways? Mr. Penimore's reply in substance was, that he believed that all corporations or individuals seeking franchises from municipalities should be subject to the future control of those municipalities, and that his views since he had become a member of a street railway corporation asking franchises of a municipality had not been changed.

James Wright moved that the report be received, accepted, and filed.

John C. Maule said that he was heartily in favor of these electrical railways, but he said there was such a thing as paying for a very desirable article more than it is worth. We can pay too much for our whistle. The argument that Council had granted concessions to some corporations without requiring them to be amenable to future legislation was a very poor one. We have been here as trustees for the people. Let us not be recreant to our trust, but let us so act that our record may be that we knew our duty, and knowing dare act as it dictates.

B. F. Gilkeson, Esq., the Corporation Counsel for the borough, spoke in favor of the acceptance of the report. He declared himself in favor of the trolley roads. He wanted it to go down Radcliffe street. Last year he was in favor of its going through Cedar street, but this year he thought that the roads should be run on the widest streets and Cedar street was too narrow. He objected to giving the roads the right to the streets without providing that they would be subject to future legislation. He considered it his duty, as Corporation Counsel, to advise the municipality the same as he would a private client. "I would not," he said, "advise any man to enter into a contract to last all time. The man or the municipality that enters into any such contract is a stark fool and a fit subject for a lunatic asylum. The point to be considered now," he continued, "is this. Do the advantages of these railroads justify you to surrender this right 'as long as grass grows and water runs'?" He expressed himself as willing to advise Council to give them 10, 15 or 20 years. Twenty years from now he thought a tax upon cars or a tax upon poles might be proper. At the end of 20 years give the people of this town a right to say whether any further legislation is needed. He thought that the borough should retain its control over the streets. The people may now, while trade is dull, be willing to relinquish this right, but in the course of a few years some exigency may arise that would reverse the feeling. "Every man," he declared, "who votes against subjecting the companies to future legislation will live to see the day when he would regret it."

On motion Messrs. Massey and A. Weir Gilkeson, representatives of the trolley roads, were given permission to address Council.

The main point of Mr. Gilkeson's speech was that this ordinance, with the provisions that the trolley companies were willing to accept, was a protection to the borough in almost every conceivable way; that the question of future legislation was exposing the companies to having the borough hereafter interfere with the regulation of fares, with the number of cars that should be run, with the time schedule that these cars should be run upon, with the appointment of employees, and that under such a provision the borough would have the right to compel the company to lay tracks upon other streets, or to remove them from streets already occupied; that all these things were matters that should be regulated by the law of supply and demand between the people and the companies, and that it was utterly unreasonable upon the part of the borough to seek to have the power to regulate these things whether they would pay the companies or not.

It was said that these companies were giving the borough nothing for the privilege of occupying the streets. He said in reply to that objection that the public that these roads would be, they not only were not asking for any public contract of any kind which would take money out of the public treasury, but were willingly yielding to the restriction that obliged them to keep a portion of the streets in repair; that this would certainly amount to an expenditure of \$1000 or more upon the streets which the public would be relieved from paying for; and that it must be borne in mind that the repairs

Highest of all in Leavening Power.—Latest U. S. Gov't Report.

Royal Baking Powder

ABSOLUTELY PURE

to the streets, annually necessary, would be repairs of wear and tear occasioned not by the cars of the company, but by the horses and wagons of the citizens; that as far as the questions involved as to the value of the franchise, and the concession to the public of the right to future legislation in large cities was entirely different, in the large cities these lines were wholly within the city limits and the entire value of their franchises was within the limits of one community, while in this case only the small part of the franchise of the company would be within the borough of Bristol; and that in large communities the opportunities for lucrative investment of money in such companies were so great that the companies could afford to run the risk of many restrictions that they could not afford to risk in communities of small size; that Bristol was not big enough, and the opportunity afforded for profitable investment not great enough to justify the running of any such great risk.

It was urged that nothing unreasonable would be asked, and yet we had, argued Mr. Gilkeson, before our eyes the example of the borough of Morrisville, where Town Council composed of reasonable men, had insisted in the case of one of these very companies upon compelling it to light the streets, a restriction that was in the first place illegal upon the part of the company because it had no authority to engage in lighting, and in the second place impossible because an electric railway plant could not be used for lighting purposes at the same time that it was used for railway purposes, and that here was an example of a "reasonable" Council seeking to compel a company to do an unreasonable thing.

Mr. Gilkeson also claimed that it left the door open to unlimited and utterly unreasonable taxation in any form that could be imagined. He said that the companies conceded the right to the borough to reserve the power to compel, at all times, the roads to be operated with such appliances and under such regulations as would best ensure the safety of life, limb and property, and also the right on the part of the borough to impose some form of taxation; and that the preservation of these rights to the borough would be much better accomplished by having them specifically provided for now, than would be the case if the companies should operate under the existing ordinance, with an agreement that no other legislation of any kind should be passed for twenty years; that the question of legislation for these roads, at a time when the town by reason of a greatly increased size might be asked to grant a franchise worth a great deal more than a franchise is now worth, would be amply met by the applications of the companies for the extension of their lines, which would be necessary when the town grew; and that if in the future the town grew large the companies would have to come to Council for permission to extend their lines and that then was the time to deal with such questions.

He appealed to the Council that if they thought these companies were desirable things for the town, to take such action as would tend to bring them here, and if they thought they were not desirable to the town, to stand squarely on that issue and to say that they did not think that they were desirable enterprises, but not to say "We would be very glad to have you, we want you to come," and at the same time impose upon us restrictions which you know in advance we cannot accept.

Mr. Massey, in speaking for the road that he represented, said that the proposition of building a line, a small territorial part of which would be in the borough of Bristol, was conceived in good faith. He said that his company could not accept the restrictions as to unlimited future legislation contained in the existing ordinance.

The yeas and nays on the adoption of the report were called for. The clerk called the roll and the vote was announced as follows: Yeas—Messrs. Harkins, Grundy, Kelly, Maule, Strauser, Scott, Weaver and Wright—8.

Nays—Messrs. Curran, Clark, Fetrow, Pearson, Robinson, Smith, Spring, Whitely and Wood—9.

On motion of Mr. Fetrow, the special committee was discharged from all further consideration of the question.

Mr. Fetrow offered an motion that Messrs. Wood, Spring, Clark, Pearson, and Wright be appointed by the Burgess as a committee to prepare an ordinance relating to trolley roads, striking out the future legislation feature, and inserting a provision that the borough shall have the right to compel the adoption of all appliances for the safety of life and property, and shall also reserve the right to impose reasonable taxation, and that this ordinance be reported in printed form at a special meeting of Council to be held at the Council Chamber, on Wednesday evening next, January 10, 1894.

Mr. Wright declined to serve on the committee. Dr. Weaver's name was suggested and he declined to serve. Mr. Strauser was next suggested by Mr. Fetrow, but he likewise declined. Mr. Scott was next mentioned and he allowed his name to stick. The motion was then carried.

The annual report of the Board of Health was read, and on motion was received and filed.

An application from the Board of Health for an appropriation of \$250 to meet current expenses from November 1st, 1893, to March 1st, 1894, was received and the appropriation ordered.

Bills amounting to \$1673.14 were presented, read and passed.

The tax collector presented a list of names of persons removed from the borough, deaths, etc., for which he asked remits, and also a list of persons for which warrants for non-payment of taxes should be issued. The remits asked for were granted, and warrants were directed to be issued in accordance with the request of the tax collector.

Council then adjourned.

Last Night's Council Meeting.

Council met last night to hear the report of the new Committee on the trolley ordinance question. All the members were present except Dr. W. P. Weaver.

The Committee presented the following report:

MR. BURGESS AND GENTLEMEN OF COUNCIL:—Before presenting the work of the committee for the preparation of an ordinance amending the ordinance of May 1st, 1893, relating to street passenger railways, we would like to state the position of this committee on the subject before council.

While we cheerfully admit and appreciate the ability and earnest endeavors of the former committee to bring in a report which they thought to be the best interest of this borough, and while we also admit that sufficient safeguards should be thrown around all privileges granted to parties seeking entrance or transit through our town, still, we insist that we may exercise such excess of caution, that we should be in danger of depriving the citizens of this borough of great benefits, by enacting such prohibitory legislation as would drive from our limits those who could and would be capable of aiding in the procurement of great and increasing prosperity for this town.

The argument has been advanced that we should look to the interest of the future generation in making our laws. This we also grant—and we claim that the way to accomplish this is to make all the money we honestly can and add more and spread it over town out further and further in every possible direction, until finally bursting our limits we shall, like the bursting of old fogies, transformed into a great and beautiful city.

Now, in order to accomplish this object we must be extremely careful not to make it impossible for men of push and energy to gain entrance. We must hold out a helping hand to every corporation or individual who helps to build up a business in the borough. We hold that the trolley companies who are knocking at our doors should be welcomed as friends who are come to do us good. We know there are some citizens of our borough who would not consent to any improvements. We know there are a few, a very few, thank heaven, who would like to keep the mills out; we know that some years ago a large factory was kept out, but we also know the vast majority of the people of this town are level-headed enough to welcome all the mills, factories, workshops, steam roads and trolley roads who wish to enter. We also know that it is the desire of the vast majority of voters who are watching us with wary eyes that these improvements should be permitted to come.

A few of our citizens, including even our learned borough solicitor, strange as it may seem, oppose granting these concessions on the ground of so-called principle. To explain the question was put, if a mill or factory employing 1000 men who would represent with their families 5000 people was to be located in this borough with the proviso that the owners would be exempted from future taxation, would you consent to such a contract? The answer was "no." As a matter of principle he would rather lose the taxes which would be assessed on 1000 necessary houses, which would amount to many, many times the tax which could be collected from a dozen manufacturing, and also be willing to lose the trade which our builders, carpenters, bricklayers, laborers, store-keepers, paperhangers and all other artisans would receive from this great addition to the population of our borough.

Now, we want to ask, is this business? There are times when principles can be ignored—and this is one of them, when great advantages are offered to the people in this borough without detriment to any of its interests, we claim it is an exceedingly poor and bad business policy to refuse them or thrust them aside on the ground of so-called principle.

We realize that we are in a position of great responsibility in this matter. We feel as if we, as members of council, should be a party to any scheme to place insurmountable obstacles in the way of these corporations, that we should be doing our duty neither as representatives of people, nor to ourselves. These trolley companies are perfectly willing to submit to reasonable taxation; therefore, their coming will be a relief instead of an additional burden to taxpayers.

The borough has been liberal to the mill owners, allowing ten years freedom from taxation, which is perfectly right and proper—it should be twenty—but the trolley companies do not ask for any favors of that description. They merely ask for the privilege of using our streets unhampered by restrictions which in future years may cause them no end of trouble, or impair their capital to such an extent as to prevent them from operating their road. A calamity which would rebound like a boomerang, endanger the borough much more than the company.

It is folly to think that by removing these restrictions the trolley companies will be free to do what they please; if successful, they will be continually needing and asking council for further privileges. As the borough expands and new streets are opened they will find it profitable to use some of them. If they attempt to abuse our liberality in this matter will not future councils have their remedy? And will it not be for their own benefit to be careful to live up to their contract with the borough? These roads cannot be compared with those operated in large cities where the lines run through miles of compactly built streets and the route is comparatively short: the profits are almost entirely derived from passengers residing within the city. But here, the roads will be only a continuation of a long route connecting a number large of and small towns, and draw from our borough but a small part of the total profits. Therefore, the benefits would be incomparably greater to the borough than to the companies.

In conclusion, we want to call attention to the fact that all the numerous restrictive provisions of the ordinance of May 1st, 1893, will still remain in full force. Thus, briefly stated Section 1 of this ordinance provides that but a single line of tracks shall be made upon any street. Section 2 provides that the companies shall accept all ordinances before having authority to do any work, thereby making it a contract. Section 3 provides that motors shall be used and the overhead wire dispensed with as soon as practical. Section 4 provides that the work shall be done under the direction of the borough council. Section 5 provides that the street between the rails and for two feet on either side, shall be kept in repair by the companies and shall be renewed from time to time in such manner as council shall decide to have the balance of the street built. Section 6 provides that the borough shall have the right to occupy a street for any purpose without liability or damages to the companies. Section 7 provides that salt shall not be used to melt ice and also provides that they shall keep the tracks clear of snow and not obstruct the street by piling snow upon it. Section 8 provides for the style and character of the rails. Section 9 provides for the poles. Section 10 provides for the wires. Section 11 provides for the regulating of the time of the cars and provides that in case of failure to obey this section for 30 days that the rights of the companies shall be void. Section 12 prohibits the companies from blocking the streets by allowing cars to stand upon the track. Section 13 gives the right of way to the fire department and to funeral processions. Section 14 provides that the companies shall indemnify the borough for all claims for damages and that the companies shall be liable for all damages generally to all individuals or to public or private property. Section 15 gives other companies the right to the use of the first company's tracks. Section 16 provides for release of damages upon the part of private property holders. Section 17 provides that the work shall commence within three months and be finished within two years, and if this is not done then the rights of the companies are void. Section 18 provides that in addition to all other rights the borough shall have the right to stop the running of the cars in order to compel the companies to comply with the ordinance. While Section 19, presented for your consideration, now gives the borough full authority at all times to protect the life, limb and property of the citizens and to pass such other future ordinances as the safety of the public may require, while Section 20 imposes the tax as therein stated.

The committee is unanimous in presenting the following ordinance.

E. M. WOOD, Chairman.

J. R. PEARSON,

J. H. SMITH,

ROBERT CLARKE,

